

## **REMARKS**

No claims have been amended, cancelled or added in this Reply. Claims 1-43 are pending.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10-14, 16-20, 22, 25-27, 29-31, 34, 36-37, 40 and 42-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Special Edition, Using AutoCAD 2000 (“SE”).

In responding to the Examiner’s prior art rejections, Applicant here only justifies the patentability of the independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 19, 31, 37 and 43). As the Examiner will appreciate, because these independent claims are patentable over the prior art, narrower dependent claims are also necessarily patentable. Accordingly, Applicant does not separately discuss the patentability of the dependent claims, although it reserves the right to do so at a later time if necessary.

All independent claims stand rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Special Edition, Using AutoCAD 2000 (“SE”). Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection. Specifically, SE does not disclose that the second (and third) magnification is adjustable by the user, or that when the second (or third) magnification is adjusted by the user, the adjusted magnification becomes a default magnification each time the corresponding portion is displayed, as recited in each independent claim.

SE appears directed to a users guide for utilizing “Zoom” commands within the application AutoCAD 2000. The instructions appear to provide for using Realtime Pan and Zoom in an effective manner. The stated goal of this disclosure is:

This gives you the ability to reapply the present magnification factor to other areas of the drawing.

SE at pg. 3 ¶ 4.

In contrast, claim 1 recites a “second magnification” and a “third magnification” and that each of these magnification levels become a default magnification each time the corresponding portion of the image is displayed. The Examiner asserts that this limitation is disclosed by SE because it:

further teaches on page 3 paragraphs 2-5 and in figure 11.3, modifying the current magnification factor for a portion (third portion) of the whole image (second portion), wherein the magnification factor is retained for further use (see specifically page 3, paragraph 4).

Office Action dated March 13, 2008 at pg. 4-5.

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion that this limitation is disclosed, the cited portion of SE does not disclose **multiple** magnification levels associated to different areas of the drawing that become a **default** each time that area is displayed. In contrast, SE appears to disclose that a **single** magnification level is used in two portions of the same drawing. As shown above, SE clearly states that a **present magnification factor** may be applied to other areas of the drawing. This present magnification factor cannot disclose multiple default magnification levels are associated with different areas of the drawing as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 (and the corresponding dependent claims) on the basis of SE cannot stand. Furthermore, while the remaining independent claims 19, 31, 37 and 43 use slightly different language, the above argument with respect to claim 1 is similarly applicable to the language of these claims. Thus, claims 19, 31, 37 and 43 (and their dependent claims) are also not properly anticipated on the basis of SE.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:**

The Examiner has rejected claims: 4, 6, 7, 9, 15, 21, 23-24, 28, 32-33, 35, 38-39 and 41 (Office Action dated 13 February 2008 at pg. 2) as being unpatentable over SE in view of various other secondary references.

Each of these claims rejected under section 103 is a dependent claim. Each of these claims is allowable for at least the same reasons as are independent claims 1, 19, 31, 37 and 43 (see discussion above). Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections and pass all claims to allowance.

**Conclusions**

Reconsideration of pending claims 1-43 in light of the above remarks is respectfully requested. If, after considering this Reply, the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be beneficial towards advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed.

/William M. Hubbard, J.D./  
Reg. No. 58,935

*Wong, Cabello, Lutsch, Rutherford & Bruculeri, L.L.P.*  
Customer No. 29855                      Voice: 832-446-2445  
20333 SH 249, Suite 600                Mobile: 713-302-4648  
Houston, Texas 77070                  Facsimile: 832-446-2424  
Email: whubbard@counselIP.com